

REMARKS

Claims 1-28 are now pending in the application. Claim 28 is new. Support for the foregoing amendments can be found throughout the specification, drawings, and claims as originally filed. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

DOUBLE PATENTING

Claims 1 and 10 stand provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of copending Application No. 10/671,203 and claim 1 of copending Application No. 10/671,204. As the rejections are provisional, Applicant elects to defer responding to the rejection until the copending Application No. 10/671,203 has been patented.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Bloch et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,922,408 B2). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 is directed to, among other things, a link transmitter allocating the plurality of data credits among the plurality of logical channels. Applicant respectfully submits that Bloch fails to anticipate this limitation. Block at best is directed to having the receiver allocate credits among the plurality of logical channels.

Bloch at best appears to disclose

[T]he receiver being adapted, responsive to traffic from the transmitting entity to the receiving entity on a given one of the logical links, to allocate one or more of the credits to the given logical link when the receiver

determines that a total of the credits allocated to the given logical link is no greater than the respective maximum limit.

Bloch, col. 4, lines 16-22. (emphasis added). Bloch further discloses

The receiver now determines the new value of the flow control credit limit (FCCL) for the lane, to be sent to the transmitter at entity 27, based on the remaining free credit recorded in register 40. . . . When this [credit] packet reaches entity 27, the transmitter uses the FCCL value as its new LAST_FCCL value for the lane in question, as described above with reference to FIG. 3.

Bloch, col. 7, lines 64-67 and col. 8, lines 1-12 (emphasis added). In other words, in Bloch, the receiver, rather than the transmitter, selects a virtual lane and assigns data credits to the virtual lane.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits claims 1, 10, and 19 define over the art cited by the Examiner. Likewise, claims 2-9 and 28, 11-18, and 20-27, which depend from respective claims 1, 10, and 19, also define over the art cited Examiner. Thus, Applicant respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner

believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 2, 2008

By: /Joseph M. Lafata/
Joseph M. Lafata, Reg. No. 37,166

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

JML/PFD/evm